

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 24, 26, 28 have been amended. Claims 14 – 23, 25, 27, and 29 have been cancelled. Claims 30 – 53 have been added. No new matter has been added as a result of these claim amendments. Claims 1- 13, 24, 26, 28, and 30-53 remain under examination.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On May 2, 2006, Ronald Pomerenke, representative for the Applicants, conducted a telephonic interview with Examiners Elani Shiferaw and Taghi Arani. Applicants thank the Examiners for granting this interview.

Applicants discussed Claim 1 in view of Franks “An Extension to HTTP: Digest Access Authentication”. A proposed claim amendment to Claim 1 was discussed. Examiner Arani stated that the proposed claim amendment appeared to distinguish over the Franks reference.

REJECTIONS BASED ON CITED ART

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 - 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over J. Franks et al. herein after Franks “An Extension to HTTP: Digest Access Authentication” in view of Garrison Pub. No.: US 2001/0011349 A1. Claims 14 – 23, 25, 27, and 29 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is rendered moot. The rejection to Claims 1-13, 24, 26, and 28 is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Currently Amended Claim 1 recites, in part:

encrypting the subset of data using at least the secret integer to generate encrypted
data that is impractical for a device other than the client and the server to
decrypt.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 in accordance with the proposed claim amendment discussed in the aforementioned telephonic interview. Support for the amendment appears in the Specification at least in paragraph 49.

In view of the Examiner Arani's opinion that the claim amendment overcomes the Franks reference, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 is allowable.

Applicants have amended Independent Claims 24, 26, 28 to recite similar limitations to those discussed in the response to Claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, Claims 24, 26, 28 are patentable.

Claims 2-13 depend from Independent Claim 1, incorporating limitations therefrom. As explained above, Claim 1 includes limitations that define patentable subject matter. Therefore, defendant Claims 2-13 recite patentable subject matter for at least the same reasons Claim 28 recites patentable subject matter. Furthermore, defendant Claims 2-13 recite additional limitations that further distinguish over the prior art.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 30 – 52 have been added. These claims are of similar scope to Claims 2 – 13, which are written in method format. However, the new claims depend from Claims 26 and 28 and are drafted in either means plus function or apparatus format. No new matter has been added.

New Claims 30 - 41 depend from Independent Claim 28, incorporating limitations therefrom. As explained above, Claim 28 includes limitations that define patentable subject matter. Therefore, defendant Claims 30 - 41 recite patentable subject matter for at least the same reasons Claim 28 recites patentable subject matter. Furthermore, defendant Claims 30 – 41 recite additional limitations that further distinguish over the prior art.

New Claims 41 - 53 depend from Independent Claim 26, incorporating limitations therefrom. As explained above, Claim 26 includes limitations that define patentable subject matter. Therefore, defendant Claims 41 - 53 recite patentable subject matter for at least the same reasons Claim 26 recites patentable subject matter. Furthermore, defendant Claims 41 – 53 recite additional limitations that further distinguish over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, the Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136.

If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Ronald M. Pomerenke
Reg. No. 43,009

Date: May 12, 2006

2055 Gateway Place, #550
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 414-1080, ext. 210
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on May 12, 2006 by Trudy Bagdon